MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN NEW YORK CITY, MARCH 9, 1939.

The eighth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1939 was held in the office of Shreve, Lamb and Harmon, 11 East 44th Street, New York City, on Thursday, March 9, 1939. The following members were present:

Mr. Clarke, Chairman,
Mr. Lamb,
Mr Savage,
Mr. Borie,
Mr. Manship,
also H. P. Caemmerer

Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p. m.

1. EXTENSION OF NATIONAL MUSEUM BUILDING: Mr. Clarke brought to the attention of the Commission a set of plans received from Mr. F. A. Delano, Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, for a proposed extension of the National Museum Building by the addition of wings on the east and west ends of the building. The wings would be 170 feet long, making the total length of the building fully 900 feet. These plans differed from those considered by the Commission of Fine Arts in November 1938 in that the extensions were to be one story lower than the main building. The Commission recalled that this matter was considered at a joint meeting with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission on November 18, 1938, and the project was disapproved for reasons set forth in a letter to Dr. Wetmore of the National Museum. (Exhibit A) Mr. Clarke called attention to a memorandum concerning this project, dated October 21, 1938, by William T. Partridge, Consulting Architect for the National Capital Park and Planning Commission (Exhibit A-1), that had been endorsed by the Commission of Fine Arts on November 18. This memorandum was read by the Chairman. After discussion the Commission felt that it would be very unfortunate to extend the National Museum Building, and the views as expressed by Mr. Partridge

and in the letter to Dr. Wetmore were reaffirmed. Drawing No. 1-5-187, it was noted, carries out the suggestion made by the Commission of Fine Arts for a building in the square to the west of the National Museum Building along Constitution Avenue between 12th and 14th Streets. This proposes a separate building leaving an open vista in the center above the first story on the axis of the portico of the Labor Department Building. The Chairman was requested to inform Mr. Delano on behalf of the Commission of the disapproval of plans for the proposed extensions. (Exhibit A-2)

2. THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL: The Commission expressed its appreciation of the document just published, entitled "A Report on the Thomas Jefferson Memorial". A copy of the report had been sent to each member of the House and Senate and also to a number of Government officials and others throughout the country. The Commission felt it was a timely document in that it calls attention to the attempt of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission to substitute cheap building material in order to complete the memorial within the $3,000,000 authorization. Also the report clarifies misrepresentations made by members of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission a year ago.

Thereupon the Commission considered an alternate scheme submitted by the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission showing toilets in the terrace and flanking the entrances to the memorial. The Commission directed that the plan be filed.

3. HISTORICAL PAINTINGS: The secretary submitted correspondence (Exhibit B) from the President requesting advice concerning historical paintings, as set forth in a letter from Miss Inglis Griswold, 46 East 65th Street, New York City. The Chairman received a letter from Miss Griswold as follows:

March 6th, 1939.

My dear Mr. Clarke:

On February 4th I wrote to President Roosevelt concerning a very important collection of early American historical portraits and paintings

which I felt ought to be placed in either the White House or in the Capitol. I received a very fine letter, dated February 15th, from the President saying that my letter interested him very much.

President Roosevelt stated that he had referred my letter to you for report and recommendations. I am looking forward very much to meeting you and taking you to see this great collection which is of such National Historical importance.

As the owners of these paintings would like to dispose of them in the near future, I am hoping that you may be able to take the matter up as soon as conveniently possible. I would deeply appreciate hearing from you as to how soon you may be able to come to New York so that I will know when to expect you. Thanking you for your early consideration of this matter, please believe me to be

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Inglis Griswold

The matter was referred to Mr. Manship and to Mr. Savage with the request that they inspect the paintings and submit a report to the Chairman. Miss Griswold was so informed. (Exhibit B-1)

4. LAFAYETTE BUILDING: The Chairman reported that when he was in Washington on February 25, he called on Mr. A. R. Clas, associate architect for the proposed Lafayette Building at Vermont Avenue and H Street concerning the design for the building and had also written to the architects, Holabird and Root, asking for cooperation with the Commission of Fine Arts in the matter of design of the building so that it would harmonize with the Government structures around Lafayette Square and maintain the cornice line of 90 feet already established there. As designed, the Lafayette Building is to be 130 feet high with a setback at the 110 foot level, which is allowed by the Zoning Commission. Mr. Clas promised to cooperate and submit a sketch showing a break in the facade at the 90-foot level at the corners of Vermont Avenue and H Street.

The secretary reported that he had asked Mr. Clas last Tuesday if he had any sketches to submit to the Commission and Mr. Clas had stated that he had

received no design from the architects but that the firm is studying the matter in the hope of carrying out the suggestion of the Commission of Fine Arts. Mr. Clas stated, "The architects have indicated a break at the 90-foot height but are not satisfied with it. They have also tried running up an architectural motif to flank the apex at the corner of Vermont Avenue and H Street to the 90-foot height and they may reach some compromise with such a scheme. Also it may be necessary to place a statue at the 90-foot setback or some architectural motif." Mr. Clas gave assurance that the firm is doing everything possible to carry out the suggestion of the Commission of Fine Arts and will submit a sketch as soon as it is ready.

5. PORTRAIT OF PRESIDENT FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT: The Secretary submitted a photograph of a portrait of the President by Mrs. Rand, received from Captain Ker, custodian of the White House, as follows:

March 3, 1939.

Memorandum for Mr. Caemmerer:

There is enclosed a photograph of the portrait of the President painted by Mrs. Rand. It will be noticed that Mrs. Rand's signature appears in the upper-left corner of the painting.

As this portrait is personally owned by the President, it is requested that the enclosed photograph be used only for official purposes by your Commission, along the lines which we discussed.

The frame of the portrait measures 52½ by 64½ inches; the canvas 43½ by 55½ inches. The Secretary stated that Captain Ker has requested to be informed whether this portrait by Mrs. Rand would be acceptable to the Commission of Fine Arts as the official portrait of the President for the White House.

The Commission decided that before reaching a decision in the matter it would be desirable for the painter member of the Commission to inspect the portrait. Mr. Savage said he would be glad to see the portrait during the next meeting of the Commission in Washington; also Mr. Savage said he would like to

know whether it would be possible to secure the portrait for exhibition at the New York World's Fair.

6. PAINTINGS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR: Under date of March 8, 1939, the following letter was received from Mr. Edward B. Rowan, Assistant Chief, Section of Fine Arts, Procurement Division, Treasury Department:

Dear Mr. Clark:

Attached hereto are photographs of mural designs for two spaces at the north end of the main corridor on the fourth floor of the new Department of the Interior Building by Mr. Edgar Britton.

The mural spaces are two panels 13' wide by 8'6" high. The work will be carried out in fresco. The subject of the designs deal with the story of petroleum and from this standpoint meets with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

The comments and advice of the Commission on Mr. Britton's designs will be greatly appreciated.

Cordially yours,
(Signed) Edward B. Rowan,
Assistant Chief, Section of Fine Arts.

The photographs were inspected by Mr. Savage. He said it would be desirable to see the colored sketches, and the Commission requested that the Secretary ask Mr. Rowan to send the sketches to Mr. Savage for criticism. (Mr. Rowan has informed the secretary that he would send the sketches to Mr. Savage.)

7. DOGWOOD IN WEST POTOMAC PARK: The secretary submitted a plan received from the National Park Service indicating that they intend to plant dogwood along the Lincoln Memorial Reflecting Basin and in other parts of West Potomac Park. The President has allotted $80,000 for this purpose. Mr. Clarke said it would be necessary to see a planting plan before giving advice in the matter. The National Park Service has been informed accordingly.

8. DESIGN FOR BUILDING AT 2125 E Street, N. W.: The secretary submitted a design received for a two-story pharmacy building to be erected at 2125 E Street,

N. W. The building is to be 34 feet high and 46 feet wide, constructed of limestone. The secretary stated that the building was designed by Wm. E. C. Barrington, formerly of Mr. Di Sibour's office. Mr. Borie and Mr. Lamb inspected the design and approved it with the suggestion that the sculptural motifs at the top of the pilasters, at the edge of the building, be removed and that the parapet be simplified. The Commission expressed concern over advertising signs on the building and it was understood that an application for signs would have to be made in proper form.

9. WAR DEPARTMENT BUILDING PLAZA: Mr. Clarke reported that he had received a letter from Mr. Nolen of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission concerning studies he (Mr. Clarke) and Professor Hubbard had made for the plaza in front of the War Department Building. Mr. Clarke said that before proceeding with the matter he wanted definite assurance that the diagonal of New York Avenue could be omitted from the plaza. The Commission agreed to this and decided to leave the matter in the hands of Mr. Clarke for study.

10. DINNER IN HONOR OF THE PRESENT AND PAST MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION: The Commission assembled at 8:00 o'clock in the evening at the Knickerbocker Club, 2 East 72nd Street, for a dinner given by Mr. William Adams Delano to the present and past members of the Commission. The present members who attended were: Mr. Clarke, Mr. Savage, Mr. Borie, Mr. Lamb, Mr. Manship; past members present were: Mr. Adams, Mr. Kendal, Mr. Delano, Mr. Morris, Mr. Winter, Mr. Weinman, Mr. Swartwout. Mr. F. A. Delano, Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, was present and also Mr. Caemmerer. Mr. Shepley, Mr. Garfield and Mr. Cross sent regrets because of illness.

Mr. Moore sent a message of greeting from Gig Harbor, Washington (Exhibit C) which was read by Mr. Wm. Adams Delano after the dinner. Thereupon Mr. F. A. Delano spoke briefly, relating his acquaintanceship with Mr. Moore from the

time he was occupied in civic work in Detroit and in Chicago, where he was living before 1910, and since then in connection with the work of the Commission of Fine Arts. Mr. Delano stated that before the creation of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, in 1926, he was in charge of the Committee of One Hundred in Washington, which aimed to bring about improvements in the National Capital.

Then a "round table" discussion took place. Interest was expressed in the Report on the Jefferson Memorial made by the Commission of Fine Arts. In view of the threatened danger to cheapen the memorial by the use of inferior building material, in order to complete the project within the authorization of $3,000,000, it was considered to be a timely document.

The work of the Procurement Division, Treasury Department, was discussed. It was thought the Supervising Architect's Office should be independent of that division.

The entire evening was much enjoyed. At the conclusion Mr. Lamb suggested that the past members constitute themselves an "Alumni", with a view to meeting from time to time, the same as the New York Municipal Art Commission does. The suggestion was favorably received and it was planned to have such a reunion every two years or so.

The Commission adjourned at 11:30 p. m.

C O P Y

November 26, 1938.

Dear Dr. Wetmore:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on November 18th, 1938, considered the proposal to construct additions to the east and west ends of the Natural History Building along the Mall. Following an inspection of the site and the existing building and after having given the proposed plans for extension careful attention, the Commission respectfully urges your consideration of a different scheme for housing the growing collections.

The Natural History Building was built many years ago as a self-contained unit in the style of museum buildings in vogue at the beginning of this century. In the considered judgment of the Commission, additions to the east and west ends of the present structure, which of necessity would have to conform to the style of the old building, would create a structure altogether too large in mass for the Mall. Further, these proposed additions would result in causing the existing architectural elements, in particular the central composition of the building, including the dome, to become completely out of scale. The original structure was not designed in a manner to permit of extensive additions.

The Commission of Fine Arts realize the needs of the Smithsonian Institution for additional Museum space. They therefore suggest the erection of a building in the square on the north side of the Mall, between Twelfth and Fourteenth Streets, constructed in two sections above the first story on Constitution Avenue in such a manner as to retain the view from the Mall of the central portico of the Labor Department Building.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Dr. Alexander Wetmore,
Assistant Secretary,
Smithsonian Institution,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT A

APPENDIX C
October 21, 1938
Meeting

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Report on Building Lines for Extension
of Bureau of Natural History

By William T. Partridge, Consulting Architect

October 21, 1938.

The enlargement of the Natural History Museum has again been brought up for consideration. There are certain basic facts and architectural principles which should be kept in mind in arriving at any decision in the matter.

The most important point is to realize that this building is part of the Mall composition and its relationship to the Triangle group across Constitution Avenue is but secondary.

The Mall or Public Walk of L'Enfant is shown on his plan as a broad roadway bordered with gardens. Along the north and south boundaries of the spacious reservation is indicated a continuous row of buildings broken only by the many cross streets.

In Mr. Mckim's 1901 adaptation of the L'Enfant design, there was no central roadway but a "tapis vert". The composition was framed by two wide plantations of elms, the distance between them being very much less than between the continuous architectural borders of L'Enfant.

Mr. McKim's architectural features of the Mall were placed between the bordering elms and the present Avenues, Constitution and Independence.

His conception of the Mall group was a series of small buildings which would not compete in scale with the Capitol or Monument. They were to be so spaced that the cross street intersections would not form a gap in the rythm of white buildings and separations of green foliage. The cross streets were a necessity, and to reduce the width of the necessary opening, some of the adjoining buildings were shown located close to the cross street curb, and in the squares where there were more than one building, the interim space between them was excessive, if one considered the layout of the single square. At the cross axis of the Mall at 8th Street, the buildings were shown equa-distant from the north-south center line.

EXHIBIT A-1

The first structure built under the 1901 plan was the Department of Agriculture. The next was the Museum of Natural History. The size of this building was so much greater than anything contemplated on the 1901 plan that it wrecked Mr. McKim's sequence of buildings and planting before it even started. Moreover, it introduced an increased scale in the size of the bordering buildings which today endangers the supremacy of the Capitol and Monument - at least until the maturing of the elms forms a mask.

From time to time proposals for the enlargement of this Museum have been advanced, each proposal planning a greater occupancy of the site. Today in place of the three buildings originally proposed, we are to have a single one nearly a thousand feet long, 250 feet longer than the Capitol.

The main east-west building lines were established as one hundred feet from the outside curb of Madison and Jefferson Drives. This dimension was arrived at only after a careful study in plan and on the site. If this set-back was then thought sufficient for the proposed small buildings, it is certainly not sufficient for a facade 980 feet long.

On the south side of the Mall, the shallow building area available will prevent the erection of any particularly long buildings, so we may see in the future some of Mr. McKim's architectural border scheme. The elevation of this building, together with the proposed additions, is so dependent upon its plan and mass, that we would suggest a further study of the architectural treatment of this unusually long facade.

While the relation of the building to the cross streets and to the lines of the new National Gallery to the east is important, the architectural treatment of the Mall facade is equally or even more vital. The additions bring the total length of the building to nearly a thousand feet, and the juncture of the new wings with the present building can be but slightly marked as they must project beyond the building line. This means that the horizontal lines must be continuous, and therefore the entrance portion and dome, now in proper scale with the size of the original building, will be woefully insufficient for a structure nearly twice the length.

The National Gallery of Art, the design of which seems inspired in mass at least by Mr. McKim's Union Square buildings (See page 41, 1901 Report) is a long building, but its length is broken by two strongly marked projecting wings and by a large central pediment. These motives facing south will cast strong shadows which, combined with the court planting, will produce much the effect sought by Mr. McKim, an alternation of light and shade.

The Madison Drive being narrow and the sidewalk only on the north, it will be difficult to obtain a satisfactory full view of either building from directly in front - so the design of the Mall facade of the Museum should be considered from a diagonal point of view, and a sharp one at that. Considerable study with sketches and models has led us to conclude that many of the defects arising from this extensive addition can be modified by the opening of two deep courts, where the additions join the main building. The monotony of the facade will be broken up by strong shadows. The scale of the central feature will remain unchanged.

41648

C O P Y

March 13, 1939

Hon. Frederic A. Delano
North Interior Building
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Delano:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on March 9, gave further and careful consideration to the proposal to construct additions to the east and west ends of the Natural History Building along the Mall.

The Commission realizes that in 1931 Dr. Wetmore, representing the Smithsonian Institution, presented somewhat similar plans to the Commission which were approved. No member of the Commission as it is presently constituted, with the exception of Mr. Moore who is absent and in the State of Washington, was on the Commission at that time. It means, therefore, that the action taken at our meeting November 18, 1938, in which the Commission disapproved of additions to the Natural History Building, was a reversal of the action previously taken. In view of this fact, especially careful consideration was given to your request that the matter of additions to the building be reconsidered.

The Commission reviewed all of the memoranda and correspondence with respect to this problem and were particularly interested in a memorandum prepared by William T. Partridge, Consulting Architect to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and presented at a meeting of the Commission held October 21, 1938. In that report, a copy of which I attach, Mr. Partridge adequately expresses the opinion of the Commission of Fine Arts concerning the addition of wings to the Museum Building. I quote one paragraph which I think more adequately expresses the way the Commission of Fine Arts feel concerning this problem than my letter to Dr. Wetmore dated November 26, a copy of which I also attach.

> "While the relation of the building to the cross streets and to the lines of the new National Gallery to the east is important, the architectural treatment of the Mall facade is equally or even more vital. The additions bring the total length of the building to nearly a thousand feet, and the juncture of the new wings with the present building can be but slightly marked as they must project beyond the building line. This means that the horizontal lines must be continuous, and therefore the entrance portion and dome, now in proper scale with the size of the original building, will be woefully insufficient for a structure nearly twice the length."

EXHIBIT A-2

I have seen the models which Mr. Partridge prepared, and these, together with the plans which you so kindly permitted me to take, serve to reinforce the Commission's previous action that "These proposed additions would result in cauring the existing architectural elements, in particular the central composition of the building, including the dome, to become completely out of scale. The original structure was not designed in a manner to permit of extensive additions."

The Commission realize that the action taken may result in considerable inconvenience to the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. They realize, nevertheless, that a more adequate solution for the expansion of the Natural History Building will result in a very much more satisfactory arrangement, which, the Regents themselves will agree, is, in the last analysis, the most satisfactory solution to this problem. The Commission of Fine Arts stand ready to assist in every way possible to bring about what they consider to be a more appropriate and more adequate extension of the Natural History Museum's facilities, by constructing an entirely new building on the square west of the present building between 12th and 14th Streets.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Enclosures

Miss INGLIS GRISWOLD
46 EAST 65TH STREET
NEW YORK CITY

February 4th, 1939.

The Hon. Franklin Delano Roosevelt,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. President:

I have wanted so much to bring a matter to your attention, a matter of National importance in which I felt you would take more interest than any other person in the country, that I decided to take the liberty of writing to you direct.

This matter concerns a collection of portraits of the greatest figures in American History, painted and sculpted by the greatest artists of their time. They are all so important that I feel that now that they are to be sold, that they are too important to be placed anywhere except in either the White House or in the Capitol. I feel so deeply about this, that I am sure that if you could be instrumental in seeing that they are placed in either of those places, that it would indeed be the greatest thing any President of our Country would have done to add to the cultural beauty of either building and to the importance of the Nation's art which portrays our greatest men up to the time of Abraham Lincoln.

This collection was formed over a period of seventeen years by the late Percy Rockefeller. The examples in this collection far surpass in importance the collection of historical subjects which were in the collection of the late Thomas Clark and which were purchased by Mr. Mellon for the National Gallery. I felt it even more important for this Rockefeller collection to be in the White House or in the Capitol, than in the National Gallery, so that the latter has not been approached about it.

Some of the great paintings which are in this collection are: The full-length portrait of Lincoln by W. F. K. Travers (an American-German of Frankfort). This is the finest portrait of Lincoln in existence, and it hung in the Senate Gallery for nearly four years and is recorded in the Congressional record. A bill for its purchase was introduced by Senator Spooner of Illinois but the Senate would not appropriate the money. Spooner

EXHIBIT B

was a contemporary of Lincoln and argued cases with him in the Illinois courts before Lincoln became President; The full-length portraits of Thomas Jefferson and of John Jay by Rembrandt Peale; the original portraits of Benjamin Franklin by Greuze and by Duplessis; one of the finest right-side portraits of Washington by Gilbert Stuart; Martha Washington by Jarvis; Washington's mother by Robert Edge Pine; Washington's grandfather, Rev. Lawrence Washington by Van Dyck; also Mrs. Lawrence Washington and Rev. Washington's mother(the great-grandmother of George Washington); the original study of Savage's painting of"Washington and his family"; the original study of Benjamin West's painting of "Penn's Treaty with the Indians"; portrait of Alexander Hamilton by Ralph Earle; Daniel Webster by Gilbert Stuart; two portraits of Henry Clay; and three great marble busts by Jean Antoine Houdon- 1) his finest bust of Washington which is signed; 2) the first marble he did of Lafayette signed and dated 1789; 3) the only marble of Robert Fulton, a very rare item. Also a terra cotta bust of Franklin by Houdon, the only other being in the Louvre. Also a marble bust of William Penn.

I am myself descended from our earliest times, one of my ancestors having been Colonel David Humphreys who was aide de camp to General Washington, and the first Ambassador to Spain and Portugal. I have a letter from him to Washington in which he extolls the great art of Houdon before the latter came to this country to sculpt Washington, the original clay model of which is in Mount Vernon.

Although I am mot important really in this matter, I might add by way of introduction that I was a cousin of the late President of the Metropolitan Museum, William Sloane Coffin, and for some years have acted as agent for private collectors of rare works of art. More important in connection with the sale of this collection if Mr. Jonce McGurk, the expert, who was responsible for the gathering together of these great items for Mr. Rockefeller, and who is acting for the Rockefeller children in this matter. He is well known by Mr. Minnigerode, the Director of the Corcoran Gallery, but it is a very simple matter to back up my statements concerning the importance of these works of art.

I have photographs of every item in this collection which I would be very glad to bring to Washington to show you or anyone which you might appoint to look into the matter. I should deem it a great favor however, if I might have the honor of an appointment to show these to you, not only in having the great pleasure in meeting you, but because I know that you will appreciate what these things are. I know that is asking a great deal when your time is so frightfully crowded with the business of the Nation.

Of course Mrs. Roosevelt comes to New York quite frequently, and if she could spare time on one of her visits, perhaps she would like to go to see the collection itself. It is all hung in a large decorated room in the warehouse and is very easily and comfortably seen. As it is rather important, I feel, to keep the sale of a valuable collection like this from becoming common knowledge of the art world at large, I will appreciate it deeply if you will keep this confidential with the few who might be vitally concerned with the acquisition.

With every good wish for your continued health, happiness and success, and hoping that I may have the pleasure of meeting you and Mrs. Roosevelt one day, please believe me to be

Very sincerely yours,

Inglis Griswold.

Regent 4-1893.

C O P Y

March 9, 1939.

My dear Miss Griswold:

Your letter of March 6th has been received.

In accordance with the request of the President that the Commission of Fine Arts submit a report and recommendations concerning the portraits and paintings, I have asked Mr. Paul Manship and Mr. Eugene Savage, sculptor and painter members of the Commission of Fine Arts, respectively, to communicate with you at an early opportunity and arrange for an appointment to view these important works of art in behalf of the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Miss Inglis Griswold,
46 East Sixty-fifth Street,
New York, N. Y.

EXHIBIT B-1

C O P Y

Moorelands, Gig Harbor,
Washington.

Dear Mr. Delano:

Nothing would please me so much as to meet the members of the Commission of Fine Arts around your table on March ninth. Like unto a certain pervasive personage who came into a celestial gathering, as reported in the first chapter of the Book of Job, I have spent many years going to and fro in the earth, and am now only returned from going up and down in it; even from the Strait of Juan de Fuca to the cactus covered wastes of Mexico. But alas, unlike Satan, I have not the gift of omnipresence, and therefore cannot present myself at your assemblage of lords of the Fine Arts.

I trust that you will have with you Olmsted to recall the days of the Senate Park Commission of 1901, and of its successor, the Commission of Fine Arts. The memory of the friendships of those times furnishes a picture gallery finer than either of the World's Fairs of this year can offer. Loyalties then established continued so long as life lasted. Loyalty to the nation to whose service willing allegiance was given as a patriotic duty. Loyalty to the inspired plan of Washington and L'Enfant, who by faith had the assurance of things hoped for and the evidence of things now seen. Loyalty to the spirit of that architecture on which Jefferson relied as "the laying out of money for something honorable, the satisfaction of seeing a proof of national good taste," as contrasted with "the regret and mortification of erecting a monument to our barbarism, which will be loaded with execrations so long as it shall endure." Loyalty to the plan of 1901, modestly devised and recorded by true artists as the necessary culmination of an original design so comprehensive as to fit "all times, however remote." Loyalty to fellow members, with respect for one another's opinions, a meeting of minds uncurbed by parliamentary forms--and invariably ending in amicable accord.

All of this I saw and in it I had some part--the part of an appreciative layman among creative artists; at times, perhaps, the part of adapting Commission conclusions to existing situations. Often those conclusions were arrived at around a dinner table at the Century Club in New York, rather than at the formal meetings in Washington.

In carrying out the conclusions of the Commission, the Chairman, like Saint Sebastian of the pictures, was subjected vicariously to the arrows of vituperative slurs and sarcasms by some Diocletian of the Congress; but found consolation in the duties increasingly placed on the Commission by the Congress of its own initiative. A President of the United States complained to Elihu Root that the Chairman was arbitrary. But he carried out the advice of the Commission as to the location of the Arlington Bridge. A Secretary of the Treasury seeking a compromise on the Great Plaza plans laughingly said that evidently "compromise" meant agreeing with the Commission. He accepted the compromise. All of which goes to prove Charles McKim's dictum--"One can compromise anything but the essence."

EXHIBIT C

Looking back over two decades, I doubt if it would be possible to crowd into twenty years more pleasure than has come to me in association with the successive members of the Commission and those persons with whom the work has brought contacts.

The development of Washington will go on so long as the Republic endures. The problems of the future will be multiplied and will be different from those of the past. Charlatanism always is a menace, and it is no less charlatanism when it pervades the field of education in the Arts. The remedy lies not in words but in good design, faithfully carried out; with the firm conviction that beauty alone gives perpetual life. You cannot go wrong or be inadequate if you follow the advice given to me by Senator McMillan half a century ago:

> "Remember, Washington is the Capital of the United States. Nothing is too good for the United States Capital. When a problem is to be solved, see that the most competent men in the country are called to solve it--and then see that their advice is realized."

On that foundation the Commission of Fine Arts was established and has been maintained. Under such guidance it must have continued and increasing usefulness to Washington and the nation.

With warmest personal regards and best wishes to you and your guests and with renewed regrets, I am

Cordially, faithfully and confidently

Yours
(Signed) Charles Moore.

Report

TO THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE
OF REPRESENTATIVES

CONCERNING THE

Thomas Jefferson Memorial

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON, D. C.
FEBRUARY 1939

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS, MAY 17, 1910

✦

GILMORE D. CLARKE, Chairman

CHARLES MOORE
HENRY R. SHEPLEY
EUGENE F. SAVAGE
WILLIAM F. LAMB
CHARLES L. BORIE, Jr.
PAUL MANSHIP

H. P. CAEMMERER, Secretary

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

The Commission of Fine Arts,
Washington, D. C., *February 8, 1939.*

To the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Gentlemen: The Commission of Fine Arts at a meeting in Washington on Friday, January 27, took up again the matter of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial. Inasmuch as the facts concerning the part taken by the Commission have never been fully understood, it seemed fitting and proper that the Members of the Congress be in possession of the facts in connection with the appropriation of additional funds for the Memorial.

In the judgment of the Commission of Fine Arts it is not too late to make a restudy of the design for the Memorial in a manner to fit the foundations that are already under construction. Such change in the design, omitting the dome and providing for an open circular colonnade of approximately the same dimensions in plan as the proposed Pantheon, would provide a memorial structure of greater freshness and insure uniformly satisfactory materials of construction.

From recent discussions with the architects of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial it appears that the total appropriation of $3,000,000 will not be sufficient to provide an entire marble interior. Such a situation in the judgment of the Commission of Fine Arts would be exceedingly unfortunate, resulting in a lowering of the standards for great memorials erected in the National Capital.

It will be noted from the record herewith that one of the alternate designs submitted by the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission to the Commission of Fine Arts on February 3, 1938, provided for an open circular colonnade of approximately the same dimensions as the proposed Pantheon design. This design the Commission of Fine Arts favored over the Pantheon, which it will be noted was disapproved.

The Commission of Fine Arts respectfully urges the reconsideration of this matter by the Congress to the end that the Central Composition of the National Capital may be developed in complete harmony with the high standards of excellence which have obtained in the past.

Respectfully submitted.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Gilmore D. Clarke, *Chairman.*

THE THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL

On June 15, 1938, the Congress of the United States passed the Second Deficiency Appropriation Bill, which included an appropriation, in the amount of $500,000, to begin work on the Memorial to Thomas Jefferson. The type of memorial had been decided upon by the Jefferson Memorial Commission which was appointed and given full authority by the Congress to choose an architect, a site, and to decide upon a design.[1]

Dr. Kimball, a member of the Jefferson Memorial Commission, favored a site on the cross axis of the Mall, south of the Washington Monument on the south shore of the Tidal Basin. In this recommendation, the members of the Jefferson Memorial Commission concurred. Prominent persons in authority suggested other locations, among them Lincoln Square on East Capitol Street, a site on the Anacostia River at the east end of East Capitol Street, and a location on the south side of the Mall opposite the Archives Building.

In 1935, The National Capital Park and Planning Commission appointed a Committee to study the different sites suggested for the Jefferson Memorial. This Committee consisted of Mr. William T. Partridge, Architect and Consultant to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke, Landscape Architect member of the Commission of Fine Arts. Messrs. Partridge and Clarke studied the several sites suggested. They consulted with Dr. Kimball and reported, suggesting that the Tidal Basin, if suitably treated, was in their judgment a desirable site befitting the memory of Thomas Jefferson.[2]

Time passed. The Jefferson Memorial Commission held several meetings. They invited the Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission,

---

[1] Personnel of Jefferson Memorial Commission: Senators Elbert D. Thomas, Charles L. McNary; Representatives John J. Boylan (deceased), Howard W. Smith, Francis D. Culkin. Representing Jefferson Memorial Foundation: Stuart G. Gibboney, Dr. George J. Ryan, Dr. Fiske Kimball. Presidential Commissioners: Thomas J. Coolidge, Joseph P. Tumulty, Hollins N. Randolph (deceased), Charles O. Andrews (appointed by the Senate February 9, 1939).

[2] Mimeographed report on the subject of the location of the Jefferson Memorial. Copies available at the office of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

Dr. Charles Moore, and the Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Mr. F. A. Delano, to attend these meetings. If Mr. Moore attended, he never reported that fact to his colleagues on the Fine Arts Commission. In a letter written March 26, 1938, Mr. Moore reported that he had fully expected the Jefferson Memorial Commission to submit a design for the Memorial to the Commission of Fine Arts [3] (of which he was then the Chairman) for consideration since the bill creating the Jefferson Memorial Commission stated that it "may avail itself of the assistance and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, and the Commission of Fine Arts shall, upon request, render such assistance and advice." The custom of obtaining the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts in such matters had obtained in Washington for over 25 years.

The fact remains, however, that the Jefferson Memorial Commission failed to seek the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts before announcing to the Press in February 1937 the design they had approved to occupy the last great site in the Central Composition of the Plan of Washington.[4] The prototype for the design was the Pantheon in Rome and was prepared in the office of John Russell Pope, Architect, of New York.

At that time the question raised by many architects and others was, "Why was this not a competition?" Up until the time that the plans for the Memorial by Mr. Pope were published in the Press early in February 1937 the members of the Commission of Fine Arts were of the opinion that a competition would be held.[5] In fact, Mr. Kimball had advised one member of the Commission of Fine Arts, late in 1936, that Mr. Pope had been appointed Architectural Adviser to the Jefferson Memorial Commission. That statement naturally led this member to believe that it was the intention of the Jefferson Memorial Commission to hold a competition.

Finally, but only after public announcement of the plans, the Jefferson Memorial Commission decided to present the design for

---

[3] Exhibit A (page 9)—Letter from Charles Moore to Gilmore D. Clarke, March 26, 1938.

[4] See releases to the Press, February 19, 1937, announcing action of the Jefferson Memorial Commission, (a) approving the Pope Pantheon design, and (b) deciding upon the Tidal Basin site. This was prior to the time that plans were submitted to the National Capital Park and Planning and Fine Arts Commissions.

[5] Exhibit B (page 9)—Extract from minutes of meeting of Commission of Fine Arts and a joint meeting of Commission of Fine Arts and National Capital Park and Planning Commission; statement of Gilmore D. Clarke.

the Memorial to the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. The Commissions met jointly to consider Mr. Pope's scheme on March 20, 1937, and to quote from the minutes of this meeting, "The design submitted by Mr. Pope, which called for a Pantheon type of Memorial, was not approved."[6]

The public press was unanimous in expressing disapproval of the Pantheon. The Garden Club of America, through its Washington representative, Mrs. Frank B. Noyes, protested against the destruction of many Japanese Cherry trees to make way for the Memorial. As a result of the unfavorable publicity, the Jefferson Memorial Commission remained quiescent for almost a year.

On February 3, 1938, Fiske Kimball appeared before the Commission of Fine Arts to present a modified scheme for the Jefferson Memorial. The design, a Pantheon, was similar to the original plans but smaller. It was proposed to simplify the treatment of the site from one of rigid rectangular monotony having an almost square reflecting basin inside of the irregular shores of the Tidal Basin to one retaining the existing shore line except for a slight modification immediately north of the proposed Memorial site. This change necessitated moving the site for the Memorial south between 300–400 feet, a change previously recommended by a joint committee of the Planning and Fine Arts Commissions. The approved site for a Memorial to Jefferson (approved by the Planning and Fine Arts Commissions) was therefore moved to dry ground.[7] In spite of the fact that the smaller modified building did not compete with the Lincoln Memorial to the same extent as the original design (in the first design the top of the dome was 21 feet higher than the Lincoln Memorial), the members of the Commission of Fine Arts disapproved it. In the judgment of the Commission, any building designed after the Pantheon would not appropriately fit the site chosen.

Since the Commission of Fine Arts refused to approve the Pantheon design in a modified smaller form, on the same day, February 3, 1938, the Architects presented, to a joint meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, two alternative designs, the first a circular building about the size of the Pantheon scheme, but without a dome; the second a

[6] Exhibit B (page 9)—Extract from minutes of meeting of Commission of Fine Arts, March 20, 1937. See also Exhibit C (page 10)—Letter from Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts, to Hon. John J. Boylan, April 8, 1937.

[7] Exhibit D (page 14)—Letter from Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts, to Congressman Boylan, February 5, 1938.

scheme consisting of two semicircular colonnades open in the center with a portrait statue of Jefferson on the axis. Both of these schemes received favorable comment by the two Commissions; the second scheme was a modified, simpler, and smaller version of the design which Mr. Pope prepared for the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial several years previous, a design which won a competition among several prominent architects. Of the two alternative designs, the Commission of Fine Arts considered this second the more suitable and appropriate not only for the site, but also as a Memorial to Jefferson.[8] From the very beginning, the Commission of Fine Arts felt that the south cross axis of the Mall should be kept open as L'Enfant intended, and further that a design possessing greater freshness would be a more suitable memorial than a Roman Pantheon, which had its origin in Rome during the reign of the Emperor Hadrian.

The architects, Messrs. Eggers and Higgins (successors to John Russell Pope who died in the summer of 1937) prepared an estimate of the cost to erect the double open semicircular scheme (the modified Theodore Roosevelt Memorial). It amounted to $3,000,000, including architects' fees. In a communication addressed to the Jefferson Memorial Commission on February 5, the Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission, Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke (elected September 29, 1937, to take the place of Mr. Moore who retired as Chairman but remained on the Commission), announced that, "A more open treatment providing for two semicircular colonnades seemed to the Commission more eminently fitting for the site and commends this design to the Jefferson Memorial Commission as one more suitable, after further and more detailed study, to memorialize the great contributions which Thomas Jefferson made to this Nation."[9]

The Jefferson Memorial Commission met subsequently, and on February 19, 1938, Chairman Boylan addressed a communication to the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, stating that his Commission "unanimously adopted the open scheme of memorial presented yesterday and advocated by you."[10] The design referred to was the double semicircular colonnade scheme, the same general idea as the plan proposed by John Russell Pope for the Roosevelt Memorial, but considerably reduced in size and simplified. It was

[8] Exhibit D (page 14)—Letter from Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts, to Congressman Boylan, Feburary 5, 1938.

[9] Exhibit D (page 14)—Letter from Chairman Commission of Fine Arts, to Congressman Boylan, February 5, 1938.

[10] Exhibit E (page 15)—Letter from Congressman Boylan to Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts, February 19, 1938.

estimated by the architects to cost less than $3,000,000, the amount authorized by Congress for the Jefferson Memorial.

In testifying before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, Fiske Kimball said:

> "What they (the Commission of Fine Arts) really wanted was a $14,000,000 proposition" and, "We rescinded our approval of this plan when the members realized that it was the rehash of the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial." Further, Fiske Kimball stated "We asked our architects to prepare another design with flanking colonnades and interior circles opening toward the Washington Monument . . . we thought we had gotten an answer for satisfying them, adopting something that was totally inadmissible, namely, following the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial. This is called Scheme H" (The modified design of the Roosevelt Memorial, two double semicircular colonnades—heretofore referred to as having had the approval of the Jefferson Memorial Commission). "We sent this to the Commission of Fine Arts and they refused to adopt it. They refused to make the slightest concession from this one scheme, and one only, except to insist that we should go back to the full dimensions of the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial, which would have cost $14,000,000. At that point we lost patience . . . [11]"

Chairman Boylan made a similar statement before the same Subcommittee, to wit:

> "So several alternate designs were considered. The only design that had the approval of Mr. Clarke and his associates was a design that had been originally won by John Russell Pope in competition for a memorial to President Theodore Roosevelt. This was a most elaborate memorial, and to carry it out in its fullness, according to the original design, would have cost approximately $14,000,000. Our authorization was for only $3,000,000. Naturally we could not think of adopting a proposal of that kind.
>
> "The suggestion was made by the Fine Arts Commission that we get a continuing appropriation; get some more money each year.
>
> "As a member of the Appropriations Committee I know it would be ridiculous for the Commission to submit a project

[11] Exhibit F (page 15)—Hearings before Subcommittee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Second Deficiency Bill.

that would cost $14,000,000 and that would make it necessary for us to come in here year after year and ask for a couple of million dollars more to finish the project.

"So, as I say, the Commission went along and acted in good faith. The whole controversy with the Fine Arts Commission comes about with the change in chairmanship of that Commission, and in personnel of the Commission."

The record clearly shows that the Commission of Fine Arts never, at any time, suggested using the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial as originally designed; neither did the Commission ever recommend a "$14,000,000 proposition." Unfortunately, the Commission of Fine Arts were not invited to testify concerning the Jefferson Memorial before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House.

When Chairman Boylan testified that "Mr. Moore was heart and soul for it, not only for the design (the Pantheon) but for the site," [12] he must have forgotten the statements in Chairman Moore's letter to him, dated April 8, 1937,[13] the first official communication sent by the Commission of Fine Arts to the Jefferson Memorial Commission which clearly stated that that Commission was definitely not in favor of the Pantheon design. When Mr. Boylan said further "In the iterim, after going on for a year or more, there was a change in the personnel of the Fine Arts Commission and another gentleman was elected Chairman" and further, "The whole controversy with the Fine Arts Commission comes about with the change in chairmanship, and in personnel of the Commission,"[14] he knew that the personnel of the Commission was the same throughout the entire controversy and that only the chairmanship was changed, Mr. Clarke having replaced Mr. Moore, the latter remaining a member of the Commission. Further, Mr. Boylan knew that his statement before the Committee, "The only design that had the approval of Mr. Clarke and his associates was a design that had been originally won by John Russell Pope in competition for a memorial to President Theodore Roosevelt" [15] was not a correct statement of the facts, which may be proved by the Congressman's own letter to the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, dated February 19,

[12] Exhibit F (page 15)—Hearings before Subcommittee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Second Deficiency Bill.

[13] Exhibit C (page 13)—Letter from Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts, to Congressman Boylan, April 8, 1937 (beginning paragraph 9).

[14] Exhibit F (page 15)—Hearings before Subcommittee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Second Deficiency Appropriation Bill.

[15] Exhibit F (page 15)—Hearings before Subcommittee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Second Deficiency Appropriation Bill.

1938, in which he stated that the Jefferson Memorial Commission "unanimously adopted the open scheme of memorial presented yesterday and advocated by you" (Exhibit E).

It will be remembered that, on February 19, 1938, the Jefferson Memorial and the Fine Arts Commissions agreed upon a design [16] consisting of two open semicircular colonnades with a statue of Jefferson in the center to cost not over $3,000,000 and to be erected upon a site on the cross axis of the Mall on the south side of the Tidal Basin. At this point, a lady entered the controversy. Messrs. Eggers and Higgins, the successors of the Architect, the late John Russell Pope, felt it their duty to advise the Architect's widow, Mrs. Pope, that they were about to proceed with drawings for the Jefferson Memorial along the lines of a modified Roosevelt Memorial design. They explained, it is assumed, that this new design was approved by the Jefferson Memorial Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts; that it was much simpler than the Roosevelt Memorial design; that its cost would be $3,000,000, including architects' fees. When Mrs. Pope received the news that the Jefferson Memorial was to go forward on the basis of a modified Theodore Roosevelt design, she refused to permit of even the slightest modification of her husband's design for the Roosevelt Memorial, if that type of design was to be used as a Memorial to Jefferson.

Fiske Kimball called Mr. Clarke, Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, on the telephone and asked him to get Mr. Moore, an old friend of the Pope family and at the time in the State of Washington, to intercede. This was done, but Mrs. Pope remained adamant.

Unable to proceed with the modified open colonnade scheme based upon a modification of the winning Pope design for the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial, because it was opposed by the wife of the architect to whom the original commission had been awarded, the Jefferson Memorial Commission promptly acted to return to the Pantheon design.

On March 24, 1938, Chairman Boylan sent Mr. A. B. Cammerer, the Jefferson Memorial Commission's Executive Officer and Director of the National Park Service, to the Fine Arts Commission to try once more to obtain approval of the Pantheon. The Commission again refused to approve a design it had disapproved on two previous occasions.[17]

---

[16] Exhibit E (page 15)—Letter from Congressman Boylan to Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts, February 19, 1938.

[17] Exhibit G (page 22 Letter from Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts, to Congressman Boylan, March 26, 1938.

On March 30, 1938, it was announced that the Jefferson Memorial Commission had decided to proceed to build the Pantheon as a Memorial to Jefferson and had the approval of the President.

Thereupon the Press wondered what had happened "behind the scenes." This was disclosed, insofar as the Commission of Fine Arts was concerned, following an editorial in the Washington Evening Star entitled, "Let in the Light." [18] The Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts released a statement to the Press,[19] and forwarded a communication to the President.[20]

Congressman Kent E. Keller of Illinois undertook a campaign in the House of Representatives to attempt to prevent the erection of the Pantheon. He was opposed by Mr. Boylan, Chairman of the Jefferson Memorial Commission. The House passed the Second Deficiency Bill, including an item in the amount of $500,000, to start work on the Pantheon type of Memorial to Thomas Jefferson.

Senator Green of Rhode Island tried to have the item in the Deficiency Bill concerning the Jefferson Memorial amended in the Senate, but Senator Glass, apparently basing his remarks upon the printed testimony of Messrs. Boylan and Kimball before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, spoke in favor of the Pantheon design, and on June 15, 1938, the Senate passed the item in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Bill approving a sum of money to start the Memorial.[21]

On October 1, 1938, over 6 weeks before the first contract was let for the foundations for the Jefferson Memorial, the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts sent a communication to the President, suggesting that the whole matter concerning the plans for the Memorial be reviewed "to the end that Thomas Jefferson may be more appropriately and more adequately honored by citizens of the United States." [22] [23]

---

[18] Exhibit H (page 23)—Editorial, the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., April 5, 1938.

[19] Exhibit I (page 24)—Memorandum for the Press, April 6, 1938.

[20] Exhibit J (page 25)—Letter from Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts, to the President, April 4, 1938.

[21] Exhibit K (page 27)—Congressional Record, Senate, vol. 83, No. 123, June 15, 1938.

[22] Exhibit L (page 28)—Letter from Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts, to the President, October 1, 1938.

[23] Exhibits M, N, O, and P are communications between the Jefferson Memorial Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts concerning details of the Memorial design.

APPENDIX

EXHIBIT A

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
Gig Harbor, March 26, 1938.

DEAR MAJOR CLARKE: This is a postscript without the usual importance of postscripts. In reading the "Minutes of the previous meeting" I discovered Fiske Kimball's sorrowful expression over my inconsistency on the Jefferson plans. Of course I saw them, and doubtless did give the impression that I favored them, because I was quite willing to have the plans come before the Commission.

It was not until the plans had been discussed and discussed in the Commission that I came to conclusions about the plans in their various phases. The report [1] the Commission asked me to write and that they approved was intended to embody —and I have no reason to think it did not—the concensus of opinion in the Commission. If it was not in accord with the way Fiske Kimball thought I personally felt, that is because the discussions in the Commission changed my mind.

Lord Bryce said to Prof. McLaughlin and me when we were starting on a tour of the British Universities in 1918, "Remember, there are only two names of Americans that are familiar to a British audience—even a university audience—Washington and Lincoln." The spirit of the Jefferson Memorial Chairman has been that Jefferson was a bigger man than Washington, and he has infected some of his followers.

One thing the Commission of Fine Arts exists for is to keep an historic as well as artistic balance.

Yours faithfully,

(s) CHARLES MOORE.

EXHIBIT B

[Extract from minutes of meeting, Commission of Fine Arts, March 20, 1937]

5. THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL: Hon. John J. Boylan, Chairman of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission, having submitted the designs for the Memorial by Mr. John Russell Pope, architect, arrangements were made for a joint session with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission to consider them. Most of the day was devoted to the consideration of the project, since it involves not only the Memorial proper, but also the treatment of the area south of the Washington Monument. At 10 o'clock the members of both Commissions and also Hon. Hollins N. Randolph, representing Congressman Boylan, and Mr. Pope inspected the 1901 Senate Park Commission Model of Washington and also a model of the Jefferson Memorial Composition as designed by Mr. Pope. After inspection of the models the two Commissions convened in the conference room of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission for discussion. The record of the discussion is attached to these Minutes and is made a part thereof.

[1] Refers to communication from Mr. Moore to Congressman Boylan, April 8, 1937. Exhibit C.

The design submitted by Mr. Pope, which called for a Pantheon type of Memorial, was not approved.

Both Commissions decided that before further action is taken in the matter a landscape plan must be prepared for the treatment of the entire area south of the Washington Monument and west of Fifteenth Street and that a careful study should be made of the estimate of cost so that the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission and Congress may be fully informed as to the cost both of the memorial proper and of the landscape treatment of the grounds, including roadways, changes in the Tidal Basin, and relocation of trees. Each Commission decided to report individually to the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission. A copy of the proceedings of the day and draft of letter concerning the Thomas Jefferson Memorial were sent to each member of the Commission of Fine Arts and made a part of these minutes.

[Extract from minutes of joint meeting, National Capital Park and Planning Commission and Commission of Fine Arts, March 20, 1937]

Major Clarke. In connection with this matter, I find it difficult to be temperate. I have been on the Fine Arts Commission for five years; this is the first time in my memory that a most important project has been referred to the Commission after it has been completely "frozen" as far as the designers are concerned. I had always hoped, and had been led to believe, that the design for this Memorial would be open to competition. Apparently, that did not seem to be feasible to the Memorial Commission. At the last meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, I still thought there would be a competition to find a group of designers who would get into the spirit of the venture so as to build into it some of the great character of Jefferson. This would have been stimulating to all the professions interested; it would have been of Nation-wide interest; it would have brought out something new rather than transporting an ancient "parti" from Rome to this site in the form of the Pantheon. It is true that McKim and the Commission of 1901 visualized this "parti" for a building on this site. However, it does not seem reasonable that that Commission gave the kind of thought to this particular phase of the Central Composition of Washington that they would have had they had more time. Since 1901 we have advanced a long way. I feel that this solution of Mr. Pope's is extremely unfortunate.

EXHIBIT C

The Commission of Fine Arts,
Washington, April 8, 1937.

Hon. John J. Boylan,
Chairman, the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Boylan: The Design for a memorial to Thomas Jefferson, submitted by the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission for advice, was considered at a joint meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission March 20, 1937. The formal presentation was made on behalf of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission by Hon. Hollins N. Randolph, who also represented the Thomas Jefferson family. The design was prepared by Mr. John Russell Pope.

The Commission of Fine Arts respectfully report as follows:

The South Axis of the White House is the most important site for commemorative treatment remaining to be developed in the District of Columbia. It is a vital element in a composition that includes the Capitol, the White House, the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial. Its reciprocal relations with these four elements impose conditions and at the same time contribute to the impressiveness of the site.

2. The location in itself is worthy of Thomas Jefferson. Conversely he is worthy, historically, of the location.

3. The present physical conditions of the location are such as to call for a comprehensive and detailed study not only of the form the memorial itself should take, but also of (a) its architectural relations to the other four elements above enumerated, (b) the landscape treatment of that entire area of the park system with which the site is connected, including both East Potomac Park and also the Lincoln Memorial area on the west.

4. The Tidal Basin is an element of primary importance. It serves the function of flushing the Washington Channel. That function should not be impaired. Any rearrangement of the Tidal Basin should satisfy the War Department. But a restudy of this project in the light of experience and in view of progress in hydraulics should be made by experts of high competence, to ascertain what changes may be made without impairing its service.

The Tidal Basin was designed purely as a utility before the reclaimed Potomac flats were made a portion of the park system. Changes in outline must be made in any event to carry Independence Avenue through to the Lincoln Memorial and the Arlington Memorial Bridge.

The opportunity is now offered to reorganize the outlines of the Tidal Basin so as to adapt those outlines to good park design. Such treatment should enhance the accessibility to, and attractiveness of, the Japanese cherry trees by providing walks along the water-edge, where now exists a rough sea wall. By relating the water to the land in park fashion the Basin should become inviting to boating instead of as now a menace to be shunned.

5. The flow of traffic to and from the Highway Bridge, now amounting to 30,000 cars (including 6,000 trucks) a day and fast increasing, is another element of prime consideration. While a reconstruction of the Highway Bridge in the future is a reasonable expectation, such is not now imminent. Nothing now should lessen the traffic flow. On the other hand, study would reveal methods of improving the present restricted circulation.

6. The importance of making the comprehensive study above outlined, and of preparing a general plan for the entire area, is made emphatic by experience. Before the Lincoln Memorial was begun the area between that site and the Washington Monument grounds had been designed as it was subsequently carried out. At the same time (1901) the Arlington Memorial Bridge project was included in the general plan. Besides the bridge proper, the Rock Creek connection, the Water Gate, the cross axis on Columbia Island, the extension of the parkway to the projected Mount Vernon Highway, and the Memorial Avenue into the Arlington National Cemetery—all were made elements of the one project approved by Congress. For the Memorial Bridge project, exclusive of the Lincoln Memorial and its park features, Congress allotted $14,500,000.

7. Given such a comprehensive plan, the work can proceed by stages under a continuing appropriation. The total cost of the entire project is bound to be considerable, owing to the nature of the location and the conditions as enumerated. But the fact that the choice of the site was made by a unanimous vote of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission, and was approved by the President of the United States, is proof positive that this vital element in the Washington Plan is sure to be developed in appropriately monumental manner.

One does not question the amount of money that may be required by the exigencies of a vital site in order to produce a worthy monument to Thomas Jefferson. Such comparisons are unworthy and belittling to both Jefferson and the American people.

Examinations already made prove that the site can be developed at a cost commensurate with the results to be obtained—namely to honor Thomas Jefferson and also to bring a now chaotic area into harmonious relations with the park system of the National Capital. Obviously this development will be accomplished at some time. The Thomas Jefferson Memorial project makes the present time opportune.

8. All are agreed that the memorial to Thomas Jefferson should express his character and achievements. Agreement stops at that point.

If the approach be historical, it may well begin with this characterization, from the brief but authoritative sketch of Jefferson's life in the just completed Dictionary of American Biography:

> Modern scholars have recognized Jefferson as an American pioneer in numerous branches of science, notably paleontology, ethnology, geography, and botany. Living before the age of specialization, he was for his day a careful investigator, no more credulous than his learned contemporaries, and notable among them for his effort in all fields to attain scientific exactitude. In State papers he is commonly the lawyer, pleading a cause; in the heat of political controversy he doubtless compromised his intellectual ideals and certainly indulged in exaggeration; but his procedure in arriving at his fundamental opinions, the habits of his life, and his temperament were essentially those of a scholar.
>
> He owned one of the best private collections of paintings and statuary in the country, and has been termed "the first American connoisseur and patron of the arts." Besides the Virginia State capitol, Monticello, and the original buildings of the University of Virginia, he designed wholly or in part numerous Virginia houses, among them his own Poplar Forest, Farmington, Bremo, Barboursville, and probably the middle section of Brandon.
>
> Before the advent of professional architects in America, he began to collect books on architecture and discovered Palladio, from whom his careful and extensive observations abroad never weaned him. Always himself a Romanist, he did more than any other man to stimulate the classical revival in America. His own work, while always ingenious, is academic, precise, and orderly, but, because of the fortunate necessity of using brick and wood, the new creation was a blend, with a pleasing domesticity. He created a definite school of builders in Virginia, sought to establish formal instruction in architecture, stimulated and encouraged, among others, Bulfinch and Thornton, and, except for the fact that he accepted no pay for his services, was as

truly a professional as they. It is probably no exaggeration to say that he was "the father of our national architecture."

The above citation is based on the study entitled "Thomas Jefferson, Architect," made by Dr. Fiske Kimball, one of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission, Director of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, and by architectural practice as well as historical study an authority on the development of American architecture.

Washington and Jefferson set the architectural style of the Federal City by their selection of the designs for the Capitol and the White House. The tradition was established by their choice of Thornton, Hoban, and Hadfield. Jefferson himself followed this style for a quarter of a century in his support of Latrobe, Bulfinch, and Robert Mills. That tradition was continued in the designs of Thomas U. Walter in the extension of the Capitol. So, the official architecture of the City of Washington was a style based on classical precedents. Such the Senate Park Commission of 1901 found it; and in that spirit they carried on. Nor has there been marked departure since that day.

If then the Thomas Jefferson Memorial is to express the character of the man to be honored, its architectural features should not vary from the classical spirit in which he practiced and which he deliberately imposed on the National Capital, especially inasmuch as the early buildings have stood the test of time.

9. The design for the Memorial itself, however, while conforming to Jeffersonian ideals, raises questions quite apart from the style in which it is designed. Fundamental among these questions is this one: The Lincoln Memorial, classical building, contains as its chief feature a statue of one of the greatest of American statesmen. The site is only second to that occupied by the Washington Monument. Is it wise to create on the south axis a second building the purpose of which is akin to that of the Lincoln Memorial? Will not the two structures so nearly alike in purpose and expression come into competition, even into conflict, one with the other? Would it not be better to make the Jefferson Memorial a distinct creation by an entirely different treatment of the central feature and the surrounding landscape?

10. This Commission recalls the fact that under authority of Congress (Resolution of February 12, 1925) the Roosevelt Memorial Commission was authorized to prepare for presentation to Congress a plan for the development of the South Axis as a location for a memorial to Theodore Roosevelt. Thereupon the Roosevelt Commission instituted a limited competition among nine well-known architects, who were assisted by landscape architects and sculptors of reputation. The judges were two architects and one sculptor. The competition was won by John Russell Pope, and the award of the jury was accepted by the trustees of the Roosevelt Commission on October 25, 1925. There was quiet opposition not to the design but to the site for a memorial to one whose place in American history time had not yet fixed. Eventually, with the hearty approval of all concerned, Analostan Island was purchased as the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial and was accepted by the Government as such.

In how far the results of this competition influenced the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission its members best know. The design of Mr. Pope for the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial more nearly expresses the ideas of the Commission of Fine Arts for the treatment of this area than does the design submitted by your Commission.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully yours,

Charles Moore,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT D

February 5, 1938.

Hon. John J. Boylan,
Chairman, Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Congressman: The Commission of Fine Arts was pleased to meet with the Honorable Fiske Kimball, representing your Commission, in Washington on Thursday, February 3, 1938, to give further consideration to designs for a Memorial to Thomas Jefferson prepared in the office of John Russell Pope. Mr. Kimball read the Resolution unanimously adopted at an executive meeting of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission on January 25th.

Further thoughtful and careful consideration was given to Scheme "X", a Pantheon. The Commission however, are unable to change the views previously expressed with respect to this design for the site chosen on the south cross-axis of the Mall. In Charlottesville, Virginia, Jefferson designed a Pantheon, the Library of the University of Virginia, which, as a work of art, has withstood the test of time. However, it seems to the Commission of Fine Arts that it would be unfortunate to erect as a Memorial still another Pantheon in Washington enclosing a portrait statue of Jefferson.

Another study prepared by your architects showing a more open treatment providing two semi-circular colonnades seems to the Commission more eminently fitting for the site and commends this design to the Jefferson Memorial Commission as one more suitable, after further and more detailed study, to memorialize the great contributions which Thomas Jefferson made to this nation.

This design, which the Commission realizes is only in a stage of preliminary study, is most fitting, simple, and dignified, becoming the great personage to be honored. It has the potentialities of a monument of unique distinction inasmuch as there is nothing that resembles it either in this country or abroad.

The site on the south cross-axis of the Mall is flat; beyond lie the broad expanses of the Potomac. This site, which the Commission of Fine Arts have previously approved, calls for a low, broad, architectural mass, the central axis open or partly open, with a notable central figure or other sculptural composition dominating the surrounding structure designed to partly enclose an area which will become the shrine dedicated to the writer of the Declaration of Independence.

The site is the last one of importance in the Central Composition of the National Capital. The Memorial erected there should, we believe, not only be suitable to the characteristics of a great American, but as well suitable to the site itself, thus to form an integral harmonized unit in the most distinguished city plan in the world.

The scheme providing double semi-circular colonnades, in our judgment, fulfills these rigid requirements of the site. We feel too that this design has the requisite attributes to memorialize the personality of Jefferson. The design we favor fills the site, blends into the larger composition of river, lake, and Mall, is unique in character as was Jefferson, is new in conception, and possible of becoming an outstanding achievement in monumental design.

The Commission of Fine Arts commend this to you and to the members of the Jefferson Memorial Commission, with the sincere belief that confidence in our studied consideration of this most important problem will be fully justified.

The Commission gave consideration to the suggestion of a monument to Jefferson proposed to be placed in the center of the Mall opposite the Archives Building. In our judgment, the simple broad expanse of lawn, stretching from the Capitol to the Washington Monument, should not be interrupted by any Memorial.

Be assured, sir, that the Commission of Fine Arts desire to be of every possible assistance to you and to your Commission and stand ready to cooperate as may best serve your wishes.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very sincerely yours,

GILMORE D. CLARKE, *Chairman.*

GDC:MVL.

EXHIBIT E

UNITED STATES COMMISSION FOR THE ERECTION OF A PERMANENT MEMORIAL TO THE MEMORY OF THOMAS JEFFERSON,

February 19, 1938

Mr. GILMORE CLARKE,
County Office,
White Plains, New York

DEAR FRIEND: I am happy to inform you that the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission unanimously adopted the open scheme of memorial presented yesterday and advocated by you. There will be no announcement before we see the President, possibly Wednesday.

As we understand the site and design are acceptable to your Commission, I would appreciate now having a brief statement to this effect expressing affirmatively the merits of the site and the design. We understand of course that details of the design can be worked out further with your assistance.

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) JOHN J. BOYLAN, *Chairman.*

EXHIBIT F

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1938

Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session on the Second Deficiency Appropriation Bill for 1938]

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations.

[Extracts from pages 919 and 920, and pages 926 to 932, inclusive]

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1938 919

Mr. BOYLAN. In answer to that I would say that some of the press of Washington have contended that the workings of the Commission were in secret; that we did not consult either the Fine Arts Commission or the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. In refutation of this, I caused to be printed in some of the papers last week a complete chronological statement of every meeting of the committee, going back as far as the first meeting that we had after organization.

We invited both Mr. Charles Moore, Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission, and Mr. Frederic A. Delano, of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and had them accompany us throughout the city of Washington in the selection of a site.

We did not make a move of any kind in the Commission without consulting both of them. Mr. Moore at that time was Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission. Mr. Moore heartily approved the design and the site.

I might say, going even a little further, that the architect was selected at the suggestion of Mr. Moore, the Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission. He agreed on John Russell Pope as being the outstanding American architect.

Every move that was made by the Commission, and at practically every meeting that was held, we had Mr. Moore and Mr. Delano present.

Mr. TABER. Did they approve what was done?

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes; Mr. Moore was heart and soul for it, not only for the design, but also for the site.

Then, in the interim, after going on for a year or more, there was a change in the personnel of the Fine Arts Commission and another gentleman was elected chairman.

Mr. TABER. Who is he?

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Gilmore Clarke.

Mr. TABER. Is he a native of Washington?

Mr. BOYLAN. He is the present chairman.

Mr. TABER. Is he a Washingtonian?

Mr. BOYLAN. He is an up-State New Yorker. He is from Westchester County, N. Y. He is distinguished as a landscape architect. I understand he laid out the highways in Westchester County, and so forth.

So that with the advent of Mr. Clarke and his associates, they took a different view of the matter.

Now, the Commission was appointed by Congress. We cannot change like the wind with every change in the Fine Arts Commission. We went forth in good faith and we had the approval of Mr. Moore and also Mr. Delano, as to the site. Now, because a new chairman of the Fine Arts Commission comes in, and perhaps new members, who want to turn this thing all around, surely we cannot be responsible for that. However, we were anxious to get the memorial built and we were willing to go along as far as we could.

So several alternate designs were considered. The only design that had the approval of Mr. Clarke and his associates was a design that had been originally won by John Russell Pope in competition for a memorial to President Theodore Roosevelt. This was a most elaborate memorial, and to carry it out in its fullness, according to the original design, would have cost approximately $14,000,000. Our authorization was for only $3,000,000. Naturally we could not think of adopting a proposal of that kind.

The suggestion was made by the Fine Arts Commission that we get a continuing appropriation; get some more money each year.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee I know it would be ridiculous for the Commission to submit a project that would cost $14,000,000 and that would make it necessary for us to come in here year after year and ask for a couple of million dollars more to finish the project.

So, as I say, the Commission went along and acted in good faith. The whole controversy with the Fine Arts Commission comes about with the change in chairmanship of that Commission, and in personnel of the Commission.

Reply to Objections Against Design and Site of Memorial

Dr. KIMBALL. . . .

. . . . . .

Now, gentlemen, the Commission of Fine Arts now say that Mr. Moore did not represent them and could not represent them, but we certainly were founded in believing that he represented them, and had the right to assume that he was consulting them.

Moreover, he did certainly consult them to some degree, because he was not alone in coming to our meetings.

As late as our meeting of April 29, 1937, while Mr. Moore was still Chairman, Mr. Gilmore C. Clarke, the present Chairman, attended our meeting with Mr. Moore, and he made no objection to the adoption of this type of memorial building, occupying the center line, and having the character of the pantheon.

Mr. CANNON. He made no objection to Mr. Moore speaking for the Commission?

Dr. KIMBALL. He accompanied him, and in that case they both spoke for it.

Then Mr. Moore was superseded by Mr. Clarke in the Commission, and from that moment a very vocal opposition came from that quarter, and a totally different suggestion.

The objection they now advance to the adoption of this design, or any such design of a building on the center line of the White House, was that it blocked the vista to the south and down the Potomac.

We said, "We are following your scheme that you have advocated for 30 years." But they said it must be kept open. We said, "If we open it, what do we see?" And we said, "The first thing we see is the railroad bridge."

They say the tracks will be down under the river. But we said, "Yes; but at whose expense?" For the moment, you see the railroad bridge, if you leave it open.

They say, "You must not follow the scheme of 1901," which their Commission has been officially urging and following for all these years, "but you must go back to the time of L'Enfant himself and to the time of General Washington.

At that time none of Potomac Park was there. The site where the Lincoln Memorial is was under water, and all of Potomac Park and Hains Point was under water. You cannot turn the clock back and leave that open, and say you can look directly down the wide open river now when all that exists.

Moreover, in some of the published arguments they go so far as to reproduce the plans of that reach of the river, as if you would see the wide-open river extending down to Fort Washington; but you do not.

With the filling in of the new proposed airport at Gravelly Point that vista does not exist, if you leave it open.

The Virginia shore of the Potomac has been extended out until it is across this vista. You do not see it spread out down the river to Fort Washington. In fact, you have to get on the roof of the White House before you see it today. It is all very well to say they wanted you to see it down to Mount Vernon from the portico

of the White House, but the trees cut it off, and Potomac Park cuts it off, and now the Gravelly Point Airport cuts it off. The river is not there as a reach of the river in this vista.

Gentlemen, my own observation of the opposition to this proposal is that it is any handle to defeat it. The opponents of this proposal seem willing to use any handle to defeat it.

Last year, when again following their plans which existed since 1901, we proposed to put the memorial on the intersection of Maryland Avenue with the White House center line, a great hue and cry arose against changing the Tidal Basin and against cutting out the cherry trees. We eliminated those objections totally.

The opposition started up all over again on totally different grounds. They said, "Do not spend the money at this time," and those were the same people who advocated spending three and a half billions for making work. They said: "Put it anywhere else; put it on the gas-works site to the west; put it on a beauty spot to the east; put it anywhere across the tracks," you might say.

Then they say, "Hold a competition." Why did they not say that 3 years ago? There was no suggestion of that plan then.

Then they say, "Do not have any columns; we do not want any more columns in Washington."

Perhaps they are right, but in this case we are building a Jefferson memorial. Jefferson was the father of classical architecture in America. He was the father of the classical style for the Federal buildings for the Federal city, for the Capitol and the White House. They have chosen this as the time to change the classical style, but this is a memorial which you recognize as having something to do with Jefferson.

If they admit that it is appropriate to Jefferson, they say it is simply an adaptation of Jefferson's own designs.

They say it follows the rotunda of the University of Virginia. It does follow such a suggestion, but not slavishly.

The Pantheon in Rome, Jefferson called a perfect model of his spherical dome. He followed that general type, but modified it in the rotunda of the University of Virginia.

Mr. Pope has borrowed that general type and modified it in detail and put it into the proposed memorial.

At the Pantheon in Rome you see solely from the front and back of it, looking something like a gas tank. That led Mr. Pope to carry a circular open colonnade around it so that it is seen from all sides, and will be beautiful from every direction.

In the many adaptations of this type which have been made, that has never been attempted, and I am sure it will create something novel, with novel beauty.

Architectural Similarity Between Proposed Memorial and National Gallery of Art

Mr. LUDLOW. Are there not some lines of similarity in the architecture of this building with the architecture of Jefferson's own home?

Dr. KIMBALL. Yes, sir; and we think that is one reason why the public will recognize it as having some relevance to Jefferson.

The alumni of the University of Virginia, brought up under his shadow and aegis, feel that this is his chosen work.

Mr. CANNON. What have you to say as to the similarity between the proposed design and that of the Mellon Art Gallery?

Dr. KIMBALL. The first thing to say is what Mr. Smith said, namely, that this design was made long before. But the second thing to say is this: The drawings, showing merely the center of the Mellon Art Gallery, picked out of their context, give a very false suggestion of their identity.

The Mellon Gallery is 800 feet long and rectangular in shape, with the cornice line in the center of a dome, which is a very minor feature.

The Jefferson Memorial design is a circular building surrounded by a dome over its whole area. They are about as much alike as a ball and a book.

Mr. WOODRUM. From a layman's standpoint, the center portion of it in each case looks alike?

Dr. KIMBALL. It does, and I deplore it.

Mr. WOODRUM. They are both by Mr. Pope?

Dr. KIMBALL. They are both by Mr. Pope.

Mr. WOODRUM. Which was made first?

Dr. KIMBALL. Ours.

Mr. WOODRUM. How do you account for the fact that he almost duplicated that in the Mellon Art Gallery?

Dr. KIMBALL. The dome falls away from the Jefferson Memorial. It is a question of the value of the porticoes and the value of the dome.

The National Museum, which is just on the other side of Ninth Street from the Mellon Art Gallery, is a long building with a low dome, and I think his adoption of such a feature in the National Gallery of Art was with the idea of balancing the National Museum, which is also operated by the Smithsonian Institution; I think the idea was to balance it on either side of the Mall.

Mr. WOODRUM. You think that is not a question which should seriously interfere with the erection of both of these buildings; that is, in relation to their similarity?

Dr. KIMBALL. No, sir; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not think this would be looked upon as a small section of the Mellon Art Gallery, called the Jefferson Memorial?

Dr. KIMBALL. No, sir. For instance, the United States Capitol, down to the administration of Lincoln, had a dome like that, and it did not worry the people. Many buildings were mounted with Roman domes.

Mr. WOODRUM. Just from the viewpoint of an unsophisticated layman, it is a rather striking and unusual situation to me, just looking at the pictures. I do not know anything about the technical or artistic ideas of it, but if you just take out the center section and set it on the Tidal Basin, it looks like that is what it is.

Dr. KIMBALL. If you did; but I should say I think that is unfair, and that is not going to be the effect.

Mr. WOODRUM. I am glad to have your comment on that, because that picture is being shown, and that is one of the arguments that will be used.

Dr. KIMBALL. I think it is just as unfair as taking a brief phrase out of a book and carrying it away from its context, without having its full statement.

Have I answered your question, Mr. Taber, as to what objection the Fine Arts Commission made?

Mr. TABER. That they do not like the Pantheon type of memorial?

Dr. KIMBALL. Officially they said that, but unofficially they say to you—and I could produce their own personal letters——

Mr. WOODRUM. Do you have any picture or illustration of the design which the Fine Arts Commission suggested as an alternative?

Dr. KIMBALL. I think the architects have that here.

Mr. WOODRUM. Do you know what the status of the plans for the National Gallery of Art is?

Dr. KIMBALL. It was approved by them and is being approved—

Mr. WOODRUM (interposing). Is that the tribunal that has to pass on that?

Dr. KIMBALL. Under that law their approval was made mandatory by Congress, and they gave it. In our case it is simply suggested that we may invite the advice of the Commission on Fine Arts, and we have done so constantly.

Mr. LUDLOW. Would it be too late to alter the design of the Mellon Art Gallery?

Dr. KIMBALL. I cannot answer that. I believe it is not quite above the foundation yet.

Mr. TABER. I think it is just above the foundation.

Dr. KIMBALL. I have understood that the present membership of the Commission of Fine Arts is very eager that it should be modified.

This is the plan advocated by the Commission of Fine Arts [indicating].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. To cost $14,000,000?

Description of Various Suggested Designs for the Memorial

Dr. KIMBALL. No, sir; I would like to cover that point. They propose to keep the vista with two colonnades forming arcs of circles, flanking a statue of Jefferson.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is the recent proposition?

Dr. KIMBALL. That was their proposition in November 1937. This is the way it would look when you are behind the colonnades [indicating]. That is one of the colonnades looking sideways, what is called scheme Y [indicating].

Mr. TABER. Did the Jefferson Memorial Commission approve this design that we have here in front of us right now, with the statue in the middle, and those two open semicircular colonnades?

Dr. KIMBALL. I will tell you what happened. We were extremely eager to come before Congress and the public with a united front, all three commissions. We were prepared to make great concessions to the Commission of Fine Arts.

The Commission of Fine Arts requested our architects to draw up, at our expense—which we gladly did—a suggestion which they made to have a scheme with flanking colonnades, as in scheme Y.

It was presented to our own Commission. The dislike of it was unanimously expressed, but in executive session—all this is in our stenographic minutes—one after another of our members expressed the view that in the interest of harmony we were ready to sacrifice our unanimous preference for the tentative scheme and to go to this one, and that was done. The date of that is in the record.

At the next meeting of our Commission it was brought out that this scheme was a reduced and bona fide version of the memorial proposed in 1926 for Theodore Roosevelt.

When that was realized by our members, one after another of them said that we were not going to have a second-hand rehashed memorial for Thomas Jefferson.

There was another point also. What the Fine Arts Commission wished was that we should follow the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial scheme in greater fullness.

The design for the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial in 1926 had a great pool of water in the center, with no statue but with a jet shot into the air, which was well described at the time as being something symbolizing the vital qualities of Theodore Roosevelt, but we believed that it had no relation to Jefferson, that we were being asked to take what was essentially a garden feature for the adornment of that part of the city of Washington.

We rescinded our approval of this plan when the members realized that it was a rehash of the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial. We submitted a third design, as Congressman Smith said, to the Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. Woodrum. No such memorial was ever built, was it, and the plan was never used?

Dr. Kimball. No; it was not built, but the plan was used.

Mr. Woodrum. Has that one ever been used in Washington?

Dr. Kimball. Yes; right in this very city. It was proposed to be put at the center of the intersection of Maryland Avenue, and the entire memorial was about a thousand feet across, totally changing the Tidal Basin.

The Commission of Fine Arts repeatedly stated that what they really wanted was for us to adopt the scheme in its entirety. They said they did that, taking everything into consideration. But, as Mr. Boylan said, they did not take into consideration the fact that the estimated cost of it was $14,000,000, and our appropriation, or our authorization, was $3,000,000. *What they really wanted was a $14,000,000 proposition.*

We tried to be very reasonable about it. We said what you want is to have the vista open, and we do not want to copy the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial.

We asked our architects to prepare another design with flanking colonnades and interior circles opening toward the Washington Monument.

Mr. Woodrum. What scheme is that?

Dr. Kimball. That is numbered scheme 3. We thought we had gotten an answer for satisfying them, adopting something that was totally inadmissible, namely, following the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial.

This is called scheme H [indicating]. We sent this to the Commission of Fine Arts and they refused to adopt it. They refused to make the slightest concession from this one scheme, and one only, except to insist that we should go back to the full dimensions of the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial, which would have cost $14,000,000.

At that point we lost patience. We said, if we cannot get them to approve something that we have made particularly to carry out their ideas without totally sacrificing the principle of suitability to Jefferson, we will go back to what we have adopted before, and we readopted it.

Mr. Ludlow. These structures were really colonnades without interior rooms?

Dr. Kimball. That is just an open colonnade.

Mr. Woodrum. What would be the cost of that?

Dr. Kimball. It can also be built for $3,000,000. But we see no particular relevance in it, whereas here [indicating], we feel every one will recognize that that is a suitable Jefferson Memorial.

I think one of our members spoke of the colonnade schemes as looking like the entrance to a real-estate development, with glorified gate posts.

Mr. WOODRUM. Tell us something about the interior of the structure of the accepted design.

Dr. KIMBALL. Here is a drawing [indicating]. It would be that style of interior surrounding a portrait statue of Jefferson. I do not mean to say that this statue has been adopted. We still have the problem of selecting a sculptor and securing a dignified statue of Jefferson, which would contain some inscription relative to Jefferson's life, and the selection which I hope and think should go around a frieze of this description is this:

> I have sworn on the altar of God eternal hostility to tyranny over the mind of man.

I think that is the attitude we have today and would like to have observed and recognized by the erection of this memorial.

EXHIBIT G

MARCH 26, 1938.

Hon. JOHN J. BOYLAN,
Chairman, Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Commission of Fine Arts was pleased to receive Mr. Frederic A. Delano, Chairman of the National Capital Park & Planning Commission, and Mr. A. B. Cammerer at a meeting held last Thursday, March 24th, in order that it might give further careful consideration, in conformance with a request of the Jefferson Memorial Commission, to a design for a Memorial to Jefferson in the form of a Pantheon prepared in the office of John Russell Pope and proposed to be erected on the cross axis of the Mall, south of the Tidal Basin.

The Commission can only reiterate the stand it originally took with respect to this design, namely, that in its judgment the Pantheon scheme is unsuited to the site chosen for reasons outlined in a letter to you dated February 5th, 1938.

The Commission of Fine Arts has, from the very beginning, given most serious thought to this important problem. The Pantheon design was first submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts by the Jefferson Memorial Commission on or about March 20th, 1937. Prior to that date, the members of the Commission were not appraised of the facts with respect to designs under consideration. Never, at any time, has the Commission considered Mr. Pope's Pantheon design suitable for the site on the Tidal Basin; it has always expressed preference for a design more open in character, possessing in silhouette relatively long, low horizontal lines, harmonizing in architectural character with the lightness of the design of the White House, and with the principal axis kept open or at least partly so.

These qualifications were admirably met by the design submitted subsequently by your architects, consisting of two semicircular colonnades, an open central axis, and in the center a sculptural motif including a portrait statue of Jefferson. This design, which was enthusiastically approved, fitted the site admirably, justified the quality of great distinction, was destined to become one of the most notable architectural monuments in the United States, and provided an eminently worthy memorial to Thomas Jefferson.

Now the Commission understands that circumstances have arisen which precludes the use of this design and that therefore the Jefferson Memorial Commission has again under consideration the adoption of the Pantheon scheme.

The Commission of Fine Arts earnestly hopes that before final action is taken with respect to so important an element in the Plan of Washington, an exhaustive and thoroughly adequate study of the whole situation may be made. It was nine years after McKim made studies for the Lincoln Memorial, the Memorial Bridge, and the Water Gate that Congress authorized the Lincoln Memorial. Time should not be the essence of a great memorial project in Washington, more particularly when that project is of sufficient importance to qualify for the last great site in the composition of the Mall. In the judgment of the Commission of Fine Arts, a more fitting memorial than a Pantheon should be sought if the Tidal Basin site is to be adopted. Mr. Pope used this form in the Archives Building and as the central feature in the National Gallery of Art, now under construction. It appears, therefore, that a design of greater freshness would more adequately honor Jefferson.

It is not the desire of the Commission of Fine Arts to delay the realization of a scheme to suitably memorialize Thomas Jefferson. It does confidently believe that other designs, and possibly other sites, might be considered, and offers the Jefferson Memorial Commission the friendliest and most effective cooperation at its command to the end that at an early date a solution may be arrived upon eminently suitable to all parties interested in this most important enterprise.

For the Commission of Fine Arts.

Cordially and sincerely,

GILMORE D. CLARKE, *Chairman.*

GDC:MVL.

EXHIBIT H

[Editorial—The Evening Star, Washington, D. C., April 5, 1938]

LET IN THE LIGHT!

The impression has been created that the revised plans for site and design of the Jefferson Memorial have received the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

Is this correct? If either or both of these bodies have overcome all of their previous objections to site and design and have given unqualified approval, such approval should be made public. It would constitute a powerful argument for the memorial at a time when skepticism continues to exist both as to the wisdom of the site and the appropriateness of the design.

On the other hand, if the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and the Park and Planning Commission has been requested and has not been forthcoming, that is a matter of great importance which concerns Congress and the people.

Again, if the advice of these agencies has not even been sought, then it is high time that both the Commission of Fine Arts and the Park and Planning Commission be asked formally to give such advice. It is incredible that the Jefferson Memorial Commission would fail to take advantage of a favorable report; it is almost unthinkable that the commission would deliberately ignore or conceal

an unfavorable report or would proceed independently of the expert advice which these agencies are in a position, in fact are empowered, to give.

In other words, let in the light! The President's recommendation for an appropriation to begin the memorial is incomplete without the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and the Park and Planning Commission and if sent forward over their disapproval would be contrary to sound public policy.

EXHIBIT I

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
Washington.

[Memorandum for the Press—For Release April 6, 1938]

The Commission of Fine Arts is pleased to comply with the request of the public press (contained in an Editorial in The Evening Star, Washington, D. C., April 5, 1938) to issue a statement concerning the action taken by the Commission with respect to a proposed memorial to Thomas Jefferson as recommended by the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission.

The act creating the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission stated in part that that Commission "may avail itself of the assistance and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts and the Commission of Fine Arts shall, upon request, render such assistance and advice."

The Commission of Fine Arts has given such assistance and advice upon request and has reported that it heartily approves the site on the south cross axis of the Mall opposite the White House on the south shore of the Tidal Basin but it has consistently opposed the erection of a building on this site in the form of a Roman Pantheon. The Commission of Fine Arts has given most thoughtful consideration to this matter and after many prolonged discussions has concluded unanimously that it is inadvisable to place a structure of this type of design on the south cross axis of the Mall.

> The site on the south cross-axis of the Mall is flat; beyond lie the broad expanses of the Potomac. This site, which the Commission of Fine Arts have previously approved, calls for a low, broad, architectural mass, the central axis open or partly open, with a notable central figure or other sculptural composition dominating the surrounding structure designed to enclose partly an area which will become the shrine dedicated to the writer of the Declaration of Independence.—*From letter to Congressman Boylan, Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission, February 5, 1938.*
>
> The site is the last one of importance in the Central Composition of the National Capital. The Memorial erected there should, we believe, not only be suitable to the characteristics of a great American, but as well suitable to the site itself, thus to form an integral, harmonized unit in the most distinguished city plan in the world.—*From letter to Congressman Boylan of February 5, 1938.*
>
> The Commission of Fine Arts has, from the very beginning, given most serious thought to this important problem. The Pantheon design was first submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts by the Jefferson Memorial Commission on or about March 20th, 1937. Never, at any time, has the Com-

mission considered Mr. Pope's Pantheon design suitable for the site on the Tidal Basin; it has always expressed preference for a design more open in character, possessing in silhouette relatively long, low horizontal lines, harmonizing in architectural character with the lightness of the design of the White House, and with the principal axis kept open or at least partly so.—*From letter to Congressman Boylan of March 26, 1938.*

The Commission of Fine Arts earnestly hopes that before final action is taken with respect to so important an element in the Plan of Washington, an exhaustive and thoroughly adequate study of the whole situation be made. It was nine years after McKim made studies for the Lincoln Memorial, the Memorial Bridge, and the Water Gate that Congress authorized the Lincoln Memorial. Time should not be the essence of a great memorial project in Washington, more particularly when that project is of sufficient importance to qualify for the last great site in the composition of the Mall. In the judgment of the Commission of Fine Arts, a more fitting memorial than a Pantheon should be sought if the Tidal Basin site is to be adopted. Mr. Pope used this form in the Archives Building and as the central feature in the National Gallery of Art, now under construction. It appears, therefore, that a design of greater freshness would more adequately honor Jefferson.—*From letter to Congressman Boylan of March 26, 1938.*

EXHIBIT J

April 4, 1938.

Dear Mr. President: The Commission of Fine Arts respectfully presents the facts concerning a recent problem relating to the Thomas Jefferson Memorial, because of the importance of the location which has been chosen for this Memorial in the Central Composition of the National Capital. The act creating the Jefferson Memorial Commission states in part that that Commission "may avail itself of the assistance and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts and the Commission of Fine Arts shall, upon request, render such assistance and advice." This the Commission of Fine Arts has done.

At a meeting held March twenty-ninth, the Jefferson Memorial Commission decided to recommend to Congress the construction of a Memorial to Thomas Jefferson in the form of a Roman Pantheon to be erected on the south cross axis of the Mall opposite the White House on the south shore of the Tidal Basin.

The Commission of Fine Arts heartily approves this site for a Memorial to Thomas Jefferson, but it has consistently opposed the erection of a building on this site in the form of a Roman Pantheon. The Commission of Fine Arts has given most thoughtful consideration to this matter and after many prolonged discussions has concluded unanimously that it is inadvisable to place a structure of this type of design on the south cross axis of the Mall.

The Honorable John J. Boylan, Chairman of the Jefferson Memorial Commission, has been advised of this opinion of the Commission of Fine Arts in two communications, copies of which are attached.

For more than twenty-five years the Commission of Fine Arts has labored in the interests of the orderly development of the National Capital; its members have been men of national reputation in the several branches of the Arts. They have

given freely of their time and of their talents with the result that Washington is finer because of these services.

Now the last site in the great central area is to be developed. The Commission of Fine Arts firmly believes that it is of the utmost importance that that development should be, not only appropriate in itself, but as well harmonious with those other elements of the plan of which it is destined to become an integral part.

The Commission of Fine Arts feels that the adopted design for the Jefferson Memorial is unsuited to the site chosen for reasons set forth in the letters to Congressman Boylan. I shall not restate these since they are adequately set forth in the attached copies of communications already referred to.

It is most unfortunate, Mr. President, that the Jefferson Memorial Commission has deemed it necessary to proceed without the concurrence of the Commission of Fine Arts. It is regrettable that a lay commission has found it desirable to proceed to build upon the last great site in the National Capital a structure which, in the considered judgment of a commission of artists, is unsuitable. The action of the Jefferson Memorial Commission is, I believe, unprecedented and while the relations between the two Commissions have always been friendly, nevertheless the decision to proceed contrary to advice cannot help but seriously affect the prestige of the Commission of Fine Arts with the result that the future development of the plan of Washington may suffer serious impairment resulting from the establishment of so unfortunate a precedent.

The Commission of Fine Arts felt it its duty to lay these facts before you that you may understand the reasons for the decision arrived at in this instance. The members of the Commission of Fine Arts are, as always, deeply conscious of their responsibilities and they would be most happy indeed, if it is your pleasure, to meet with you to discuss this important problem in the plan of Washington.

"The Commission of Fine Arts earnestly hopes that before final action is taken with respect to so important an element in the Plan of Washington, an exhaustive and thoroughly adequate study of the whole situation may be made. It was nine years after McKim made studies for the Lincoln Memorial, the Memorial Bridge, and the Water Gate that Congress authorized the Lincoln Memorial. Time should not be the essence of a great memorial project in Washington, more particularly when that project is of sufficient importance to qualify for the last great site in the composition of the Mall. In the judgment of the Commission of Fine Arts, a more fitting memorial than a Pantheon should be sought if the Tidal Basin site is to be adopted. Mr. Pope used this form in the Archives Building and as the central feature in the National Gallery of Art, now under construction. It appears, therefore, that a design of greater freshness would more adequately honor Jefferson."

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

GILMORE D. CLARKE, *Chairman.*

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT K

[Congressional Record, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, volume 83, No. 123, Washington, Wednesday, June 15, 1938]

[Extracts from pages 12369 and 12370]

Mr. GLASS . . .

. . . . . .

It has been stated in the Senate that Mr. Moore, the chairman of the Fine Arts Commission, was opposed to this proposition. As a matter of fact, the record shows that he was heartily in favor of both the site and of the plan. The architect was the greatest architect of this era, if not the greatest architect this country ever produced, John Russell Pope. *He was appointed by Mr. Moore, the chairman of the Commission.*

. . . . . .

The Senator from Utah (Mr. Thomas), a member of the committee, said:

> I think no one in this day and age can depreciate in the least the value of monuments in reflecting the belief of the American people in democracy. . .
>
> The type of monument and the place for the monument were subjects that our Commission has considered carefully during the last 3 or 4 years.
>
> There has been no lack of difference of opinion, but we have come to a unanimous understanding in the decision which we have now made. And we come before you asking in a united way that you give consideration to our decision and recognize the propriety of starting at once to carry out the authorization that has been made by Congress.

It is stated that the Fine Arts Commission as now composed is opposed to this monument and to the site. That comes from the fact that Mr. Moore, who was one of the most distinguished men ever to occupy a place on the Fine Arts Commission, resigned; and the New York landscape architect who has succeeded him wants to figure in the picture. Therefore, he and some new members of the Commission are undertaking to reverse the action previously taken.

The matter was elaborately discussed in the House of Representatives, and by a vote of 2 to 1 the present design, and the site presented by this Commission, were agreed to.

I do not want to delay the Senate, because I have no idea the Senate is going to subscribe to this suggestion. The alternative proposal of the new Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission was to construct a monument, the estimated cost of which was $14,000,000, as compared to this modest cost of $3,000,000 for the design and the site unanimously agreed upon by the Commission.

I may suggest that with greater propriety one of the senatorial members of the Commission might resist this proposition. I have particularly in mind the distinguished Senator from Utah (Mr. Thomas), whose cultural accomplishments, I think, would compare very favorably with those of the present Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission, who wants us to build a $14,000,000 monument to Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. President, I think it is an unutterable shame that 150 years should have elapsed without a memorial being erected in the Capital of the Nation to the man who wrote the Declaration of Independence, the very foundation of our national existence.

The proposal to permit the new Fine Arts Commission, the chairman of which has changed his attitude, to determine whether the memorial shall be built means that nothing will be done, because Congress is not going to appropriate $14,000,000 for a monument to anybody at this time.

. . . . . .

The present monument will in no way cut off the view of the Potomac, because the design of the monument is open all around, and any one will be able to see through it when it is completed. The opposition to the building of the monument, to the site, and to the design is in no sense comparable to the opposition which was displayed at the time the Lincoln Memorial was built. If those of us who look at the Lincoln Memorial today will realize that there were persons who opposed the site, opposed the design, and opposed everything about it, we can see that those who are recommending building the monument in the place selected, and with the type of building selected, will probably receive the approval of future generations.

The Vice President. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Green).

The amendment was rejected.

EXHIBIT L

October 1, 1938.

Dear Mr. President: Your Commission of Fine Arts reported last April fourth concerning the status of the Memorial to Thomas Jefferson, a project of major importance in the plan of the Nation's Capital. Since that report, Congress has decreed that that Memorial shall be constructed in accordance with plans which were not approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

Your Commission desires to place before you certain facts leading up to this action of the House of Representatives and the Senate. The Commission fully believe that once Congress has all the facts in a case presented they decide a given question wisely and on the merit of those facts. However, when a portion of the facts are withheld, or when Congress is hurried into a choice without time for full deliberation, then the decision reached may not be wholly wise.

In the case of the Jefferson Memorial certain facts were withheld, the decision was hurried, and in addition other facts were grossly misrepresented by at least one member of the Jefferson Memorial Commission before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, as the record of that Hearing discloses.

Your Commission of Fine Arts fully believe that they acted in the best interests of the President, the Congress, the Jefferson Memorial Commission, and the people of the United States when they strongly advocated that a design indefensibly pedantic cannot represent the modern social feelings and character of your administration and our time and suitably honor Jefferson.

The proposed Memorial moreover seriously violates the established interrelationship of the principal elements of L'Enfant's Plan and the development of Washington today. The Commission still firmly believe that a Pantheon, a symbol of Imperial Rome, a slavish copy of a building erected by the Emperor Hadrian, is not representative of Thomas Jefferson and his significant contributions to the Nation still pertinent to today's problems.

The Commission further believe that it may not be too late to reconsider this matter. A canvass of the architectural and artistic professions in the United States would disclose, we believe, that, among those most competent to judge, a large majority is overwhelmingly opposed to the erection of a Roman Pantheon, of which there are already many in the United States, the latest prototype having been erected recently in Philadelphia to honor Benjamin Franklin.

Since the Commission of Fine Arts were not invited to be heard before the Committee of the House of Representatives, and since in our opinion the action of the Commission was misrepresented before that Committee, it appears that the President may possibly be interested in reviewing this matter with the Commission to the end that Thomas Jefferson may be more appropriately and more adequately honored by citizens of the United States.

The Commission of Fine Arts regret exceedingly the unfortunate controversy which arose; they further regret that it became necessary, on the part of at least one of the chief proponents of the Pantheon scheme, to misrepresent the facts in the case. Your Commission view this matter as of great significance in the development of the Nation's Capital and respectfully request the President's consideration of the facts to the end that the Central Composition of the National Capital may be developed in harmony with the great traditions which have obtained in the past.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully yours,

GILMORE D. CLARKE, *Chairman.*

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT M

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
Washington, January 3, 1939.

DEAR MR. GIBBONEY: At the last meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held in Washington on December 10th, Mr. A. B. Cammerer, Executive Officer of the Jefferson Memorial Commission, presented working drawings for the Memorial Building to Thomas Jefferson. Mr. Cammerer requested the Commission's advice upon the detailed treatment of the proposed structure. With this request the Commission is glad to comply. Accordingly the architect members, Messrs. Shepley, Lamb, and Borie were requested to review the plans, which they have done.

On Thursday, December 22nd, I arranged a meeting in New York at the office of Mr. Lamb, for the purpose of reviewing the comments of the architect members of the Commission of Fine Arts with Mr. Otto Eggers, representing the architects. Messrs. Lamb, Eggers, one of Mr. Eggers' representatives, and the writer were present.

The architects of the building indicated their desire to give all possible consideration to the suggestions made to the end that the plans for the building might be improved. Mr. Eggers promised to take up new problems as they arise and to report back concerning the suggestions that were made at the conference.

For the information of your Commission I set forth herewith the items which were discussed with Mr. Eggers.

I. *Detail and ornamentation.*—a. The character of the ornament was criticized as lacking originality and appropriateness. For example, the indicated architectural ornaments in certain panels of the interior (eagle or wreath motive), first used in the Forum of Trajan, have been repeated so many times during the past fifty years that they have lost all significance. The Commission suggests the possibility of having the bas relief designed by a sculptor so that it may in some appropriate manner represent the character of the great figure the building is to memorialize.

b. The light-standards shown are also of a hackneyed design. In the discussion of this item the whole problem of lighting the interior came up. Mr. Eggers agreed to make further studies, taking into consideration certain definite suggestions made by Mr. Lamb. This is a most important problem and requires careful thought and much study before a satisfactory but simple solution may be found.

c. It was observed that the architects had designed the pedestal for a statue of Jefferson. This design should not be determined until a sculptor has completed his work. Whether the figure of Jefferson is to be erect or seated is not a matter which can be determined by the architect. The Commission of Fine Arts urges that a sculptor be chosen, preferably by competition, as soon as possible so that the portrait figure of Jefferson, the enclosing of which is the real purpose the building is to serve, may be studied in collaboration with the architects, rather than be added as an afterthought.

d. The Commission believes that the tripods on the piers each side of the entrance steps are unnecessary. These come under the heading of architectural sculpture and are trite in design. It is believed that the more simple treatment, gained by the omission of these, would be much more appropriate.

II. *Plan.*—The Commission of Fine Arts questions the propriety of including public toilets within a memorial of the character of this one. If in the judgment of the Jefferson Memorial Commission they must be included as a part of the scheme then the entrances to these toilets should be placed at different locations than indicated on the plan, namely, each side of the main entrance just inside the portico. This treatment, the Commission believes, is extremely bad taste. Alternate locations at much less conspicuous places on the plan for these toilet entrances were indicated to the architects.

The Commission of Fine Arts prefer that toilets be excluded from the memorial building and that a small unobtrusive structure be erected in a grove of trees near one of the parking spaces in the close vicinity of the memorial. Such a location would serve a more useful purpose and could be designed and placed in a manner to be completely hidden from view from the memorial and from important points around the memorial. This suggestion is presented for your careful consideration since criticism is bound to follow if public toilets are included as an integral part of the memorial.

III. *Materials of construction.*—a. The transition from the marble exterior to the limestone interior has been badly developed. The plan shows one pilaster of a pair in marble, the other in limestone. In order to keep the structure within a budget it has become necessary to economize on the material for the interior. Such treatment as has been indicated is unfortunate and should be developed more carefully after further study. The Commission do not advocate a more expensive building, but rather a careful review of what has been planned, to the end that not too great sacrifice in the materials for the interior design may be necessary. It may be

possible to save elsewhere so that the building itself may be all that your Commission desires.

It was pointed out to Mr. Eggers that it would be desirable to take an alternate bid on an all marble interior below but including the cornice.

The problem concerning the materials for the inside of the building was discussed at length with Mr. Eggers, who agreed to give further study to this matter.

A copy of this communication has been forwarded to Mr. A. B. Cammerer.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Mr. Stuart Gibboney,
Acting Chairman, The Jefferson Memorial Commission,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT N

United States Commission for the Erection of a Permanent
Memorial to the Memory of Thomas Jefferson, 1743–1826,
70 Pine Street, New York, N. Y., January 18, 1939.

Hon. Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman, The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Clarke: Your letter to me as Acting Chairman of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission, under date of January 3, 1939, with reference to the working drawings for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Building, went to the House Office Building in Washington and was not received by me until January 10th. After its receipt I conferred with several members of the Commission and submitted a copy of it to our architects, Messrs. Eggers and Higgins, who reported to us the pleasant conference they had with you and Mr. Lamb.

Our architects have made the following recommendations as to the points raised in your letter:

1. (a) The suggestion made by Mr. Clarke entails the employment of a sculptor which must be covered by additional allowance. We agreed, however, to provide stock for any further carving developed by a sculptor. We felt a creditable result could be obtained from an architectural model made under our direction, or if necessary the entire elimination of the carved decoration and the panels devoted exclusively to inscriptions.

(b) The light standards in the Memorial Hall are to be included in the tenders, with an alternate for their omission. We felt that the lighting standards shown would provide in a most impressive manner the little lighting required inasmuch as the building may never be open at night. The entire question of the lighting of the Memorial Hall is to receive further consideration.

We are entirely opposed to the suggestion made by the Fine Arts Commission to provide cove lights over the cornice to give a brightly lighted inner dome.

(c) We concur with the opinion of the Art Commission that the inclusion of a design for the pedestal might be a hardship to a sculptor yet to be selected, conse-

quently we agreed to omit this and to carry same under an allowance to be added to that provided for the statue proper. As to the method of selection of a sculptor, that is within the province of the Jefferson Memorial Commission.

(d) We have no serious objection to the elimination of the exterior tripods, and have agreed to provide an alternate estimate for their omission.

Their purpose as originally conceived was to provide receptacles for exterior flood lighting units. The Commission's representatives objected to this form of exterior lighting and suggested lighting the back walls of the Portico, throwing the columns into relief.

2. The public toilets are located on the plan as directed by the National Park Service.

Plans have been prepared showing entrances to toilet facilities at each end of the circular surrounding colonnade as suggested by Mr. Clarke. This toilet arrangement has been rejected by the National Park Service with the counter suggestion that the toilets be installed under the outer terrace. This will entail extra building expense and extra piling, the contract for which has already been let. We feel that the best solution is that they be either entirely eliminated from this consideration or installed as shown on the present plans.

3. Alternate estimates will cover several variations of arrangement of marble and limestone in the interior. Our budget limitations decidedly preclude the use of marble throughout, and some form of compromise is essential.

We feel that the steps taken by our architects, as described above, will go a long way toward meeting the points raised in your letter.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Stuart G. Gibboney,
Acting Chairman.

EXHIBIT O

United States Department of the Interior,
National Park Service,
Washington, January 26, 1939.

[Memorandum for the Director]

A review of the revised specifications for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Superstructure as submitted by the Architects on January 20 indicates that they had made the following disposition of the recommendations by the Fine Arts Commission:

The carving of the panels is not included in the specifications. This portion of the work is left for future consideration.

The light standards are omitted.

The pedestal for the statue is omitted.

There is a provision for taking an alternative for omission of tripods, leaving the final decision to the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission.

The toilet rooms are left in the Memorial as originally planned by the Architects.

There will be alternatives covering the suggestions by the Fine Arts Commission as they relate to the use of limestone and marble, leaving the final decision to the Jefferson Memorial Commission when the bids are canvassed.

(Signed) G. E. Gillen,
Chief, Survey and Construction Division.

EXHIBIT P

JANUARY 28, 1939.

Mr. STUART G. GIBBONEY,
70 Pine Street,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. GIBBONEY: I appreciate having your letter of January eighteenth with reference to the working drawings for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Building. At a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held Friday, January twenty-seventh, I received copy of a memorandum from the Chief of the Survey and Construction Division of the National Park Service, copy of which I attach. I wish to refer particularly to one sentence, namely, "The toilet rooms are left in the Memorial as originally planned by the Architects."

The Commission of Fine Arts discussed this matter quite fully at their meeting, and I was directed to write to you and emphasize again the fact that in the judgment of the Commission the inclusion of toilets with entrances to them from the portico of the Memorial is in extremely bad taste. One member of the Commission stated that since these public toilets were the only ones in that general vicinity of the Capital City they would become well known to tourists in the course of time and that the Memorial would be used by persons who have no other interest than to visit these toilets. I wish to call your attention to this matter because it may become exceedingly embarrassing to you and to the other members of the Commission as time goes on. I wish again to call your attention to the recommendations of the Commission "That the toilets be excluded from the Memorial Building and that a small unobtrusive structure be erected in a grove of trees near one of the parking spaces in the close vicinity of the Memorial." To say that the inclusion of public toilets in a great Memorial is incongruous is to put it mildly.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Respectfully yours,

(Signed) GILMORE D. CLARKE,
Chairman.

GDC:MVL.
Enc.

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1939

United States Commission
for the Erection of a Permanent Memorial to the Memory of
Thomas Jefferson
1743 -- 1826

RECEIVED
THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON, D. C.
JUN 23 1936

COMMISSIONERS

UNITED STATES SENATE

ELBERT D. THOMAS — UTAH
AUGUSTINE LONERGAN — CONNECTICUT
CHARLES L. McNARY — OREGON

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JOHN J. BOYLAN — NEW YORK
HOWARD W. SMITH — VIRGINIA
FRANCIS D. CULKIN — NEW YORK

THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL FOUNDATION

STUART G. GIBBONEY
DR. GEORGE J. RYAN
DR. FISKE KIMBALL

CHAIRMAN
REPRESENTATIVE JOHN J. BOYLAN

VICE CHAIRMEN
ELBERT D. THOMAS
AUGUSTINE LONERGAN
CHARLES L. McNARY

SECRETARY
HOWARD W. SMITH

PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSIONERS
THOMAS J. COOLIDGE — JOSEPH P. TUMULTY
HOLLINS S. RANDOLPH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
JOHN J. BOYLAN
ELBERT D. THOMAS
AUGUSTINE LONERGAN
CHARLES L. McNARY
HOWARD W. SMITH
FRANCIS D. CULKIN
JOSEPH P. TUMULTY
HOLLINS S. RANDOLPH
STUART G. GIBBONEY
DR. FISKE KIMBALL

June 22, 1936.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. H.P. Caemmerer,
Secretary and Administrative Officer,
Fine Arts Commission,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:-

I have taken up the matter of the publication of the preliminary plans, sketches and designs of the proposed Thomas Jefferson Memorial with the members of the Commission; and the consensus of opinion seems to be that inasmuch, as the plans are not going to be adopted by the Commission, it would be misleading and cause trouble. In view of these circumstances, we feel that they should not be published.

We expect to have a permanent design to submit to you for your next report.

Cordially yours,

CHAIRMAN